



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Jews of England in the Twelfth Century.

ABRAHAM IBN EZRA'S stay in London in the middle of the twelfth century, and the events connected with the coronation of Richard I., culminating in the York tragedy at the end of this same century ; these are the two points of Jewish history which to this very day are universally regarded as those touches which England contributes to the picture of the century, rich as it is with the delineations of characters and episodes. But if, in this respect, matters are henceforth to undergo a change, if in future, in treating of the history of the twelfth century, a special and certainly not uninteresting chapter will be devoted to the Jews of England, it will be owing to the merit of the work before us,¹ edited by Mr. Joseph Jacobs, contributing as he does therein a vast store of new material to our knowledge upon matters of Jewish interest referring to those times. Agreeably to the plan of works of a similar character, the book, which is rendered attractive by means of illustrations and facsimiles, contains a large number of records and abstracts, which give one a clear view of the history of the period described.

These are the evidences and expressions of contemporaries, which afford us an insight into the conditions, social life, and literary activity of the English Jews. They reach as far as the beginning of the thirteenth century, exactly to the year 1206, which the author regards with good reason as the end of the period which he describes, England having in that year, under King John, lost Normandy, and the close connection which had hitherto existed between the Jews of England and their coreligionists in France having thereby been interrupted. There are few records dealing with the time prior to the twelfth century (pp. 1 to 12, 255). The first mention of Jews in London occurs about the year 1115 (p. 13), and the "Pipe-Rolls," which are the chief sources (though as yet only partially published) for the knowledge of the external conditions of the Jews of England, only begin to afford us their invaluable information at the year 1130.

But from this year onward such a mass of data is at the service of the historian that (as the author rightly emphasises) no country of

¹ "The Jews of Angevin England. Documents and Records from Latin and Hebrew Sources." By Joseph Jacobs. London, 1893.

Europe possesses for the history of the Jews in the twelfth century so rich a stock of documentary material as England.

As a matter of course, a considerable portion of those writings, having reference to the spiritual life of the Jews, which Mr. Jacobs has included in his collection as of English origin, are—as regards their origin—of a more or less hypothetical character. Just as a bold conqueror, the author of this work, inspired with enthusiasm for his subject, grasped into the depth of the wealth of personages and names supplied by the history of the Jewish literature of the twelfth century, and by ingenious identification filled up the gap left by the rolls of the Treasury, and documents bearing chiefly on financial matters. But it is just out of these records, apparently far removed from the field of literature, that he has drawn such data as facilitate his conquest of details, and on the basis of which he assigns English citizenship to the bearers of many a well-known name.

Such a combination of isolated facts as a means of historical investigation is triumphantly successful in Mr. Jacobs' book, and I must confess that these triumphs seem to me to signify at least partially real results and lasting conclusions in the domain of Jewish literature.

These very portions of the work before us are calculated in the highest degree to fascinate every friend and student of Jewish history, and it is with these mainly that the following remarks which I devote to the work are intended to deal.

In the appendix of this book, in which Mr. Jacobs endeavours to systematise the scattered details which appear in the body of the work itself, he devotes a chapter to the "Anglo-Jewish Rabbis" of the twelfth century, and gives an alphabetical list of twenty-seven names, being the representatives in England of Jewish scholarship, and in part of general literature during that period. For the most part these names are obtained by means of a combination of data supplied by the Treasury Rolls, and names which figure largely in the Tosaphistic literature.

To proceed to special cases. In the Rolls mention is made in the year 1131 of Rabi Gotsce (also Rubi G.), *i.e.*, Rabbi Joseph, of London, who must be regarded as the acknowledged head of the London Jewry at the time. His son was "Isaac fil Rabbi Jose," one of the leading personages at the time of Richard I., and often cited in the records. Another son was "Abraham fil Rabbi," one who also figures frequently in the records. They form quite a line, mention being made in 1199 (p. 204) of a son of Isaac—thus of the third generation—named after his grandfather, Josce.

Now, the question arises whether this Rabbi Jose, or Joseph of

London, was not also a rabbinic authority well-known beyond England. Mr. Jacobs is of opinion that he was. On page 15 (note) it appears to him "probable"; but, as the book advances, it is regarded by him as a simple fact that "Rabi Gotsce" is none other than R. Joseph of Orleans, one of the most prominent Tosaphists, who occasionally appears as R. Joseph, without reference to the place from which he hailed. Upon the strength of this identity. Mr. Jacobs reproduces (p. 25), in an abridged form, the contents of a highly interesting Responsum, as it appears in R. Tam's *Sepher Hajashar*, in which Joseph ben Isaac (*i.e.*, as already suggested by Zunz, Joseph of Orleans), in conjunction with Solomon ben Isaac, put a remarkable case of dispute before R. Tam in Rameru. He seems to assume that England was the seat of this dispute, in which a noble lady refused to take back, without compensation, a carriage which had been pledged with a Jew, on the ground that another Jew had made use of it; and that Joseph ben Isaac placed this case, sent up from London, in concert with R. Solomon ben Isaac, a higher authority, before R. Tam for decision. But it is incorrect to make this assumption, for in the *Sepher Hajashar* it is distinctly stated at the head of the said Responsum שאלה מאורליינים לרבינו תם, that the question came from Orleans. It is clear that the case arose on French territory, from the account itself, which states that one party advised the other to have the dispute decided at the Jewish Tribunal in Paris (71*b*, ביררתני פריש לא רצה; ויקראני לכת לפריש).

The further argument of Mr. Jacobs falls, in consequence, to the ground, *viz.*, that derived from the discovery of a remarkable seal at Edinburgh (p. 26), by reason of which he assumes the identity of Solomon ben Isaac, whose name appears on the seal, with the R. Solomon ben Isaac named in the Responsum.

Assuming, however, that the ingenious conjecture of our author be correct, that the Solomon b. Isaac — styled according to the Hebrew lettered inscription on the seal in Arabic אלתעמם, "who has donned the turban"—fled to England in consequence of the Spanish troubles of 1145, in that case every chance of identifying him with his namesake in the Responsum would be cut off, inasmuch as the latter was clearly no refugee from Spain, but a Rabbi in Orleans. We find the name of Solomon ben Isaac mentioned once more in connection with that of R. Joseph ben Isaac as the author of an Halachic decision in the Mordechai on Ketuboth, § 227 (according to the correct reading adduced by Sam. Kohn in Grätz's *Monatsschrift*, 1878, p. 93).

There is, therefore, no proof, beyond the similarity of names, that the wealthy Rabbi Jose, who had already settled in London in 1131,

is identical with R. Joseph of Orleans, the contemporary of R. Tam.

It is, nevertheless, possible that this is the case, while the circumstance that the name of the father of the latter was Isaac may probably strengthen the conjecture, considering that the son of R. Jose of London was also named Isaac, which would be after his grandfather. A further support may be found in the name of the second son of the London Rabbi Jose, Abraham; for R. Joseph of Orleans also had a son Abraham, cited among the Tosaphists, and specially known as the father-in-law of the celebrated R. Jehuda Sir Leon, of whom we shall have something more to say. And even this latter point, that Sir Leon was the son-in-law of Abraham b. Joseph, is employed by Mr. Jacobs as an argument in favour of the identity of the Tosaphist Abraham of Orleans with the wealthy Abraham of London, since Sir Leon, according to the author's very plausible assumption, was a resident of London in his early years, and, *e.g.*, the oldest list of London Jews, dating from the year 1186 (*vide* p. 88), is headed with the names of Abraham fil Rabbi and Leo Blud (= Sir Leon), father-in-law and son-in-law. Yet it is surprising that, if Abraham be the son of "Rabbi Gotsce" of London, and consequently hailed from London, he should be designated in these sources as "Abraham of Orleans," as in the second of the Halachic portions cited on p. 178, in which instance Mr. Jacobs has omitted to give the source, *viz.*, *Mordechai Aboda Zara*, II. 830.

Although no real proof exists for the identity, and there is possibly nothing more than an accidental similarity of names, we might yet, after what has been said above, allow the identity of the Tosaphist Joseph of Orleans and his son Abraham with Rabbi Joseph of London and his son Abraham. But our author goes further still in his process of identification. Without further ado, he asks us to regard Joseph of Orleans as none other than the Exegete Joseph Bechor Schor; so that, according to his theory, one of the most celebrated representatives of the Northern-French School of Exegetes and the foremost member of the London Jewry in the first half of the twelfth century are one and the same person.

But for this identity Mr. Jacobs does not adduce the least trace of evidence whatsoever. He simply states (p. 15), as though it was an established fact, "who is also known by the name of Joseph Bechor Schor."¹ None of the former inquirers into the subject of Tosaphist literature ever conceived the idea of regarding these two Josephs, the Exegetist and the Halachist, as the same personage—not Zunz,

¹ P. 259: "R. Joseph Bechor Schor, who is also known as R. Joseph of Orleans."

nor Neubauer, nor Kohn (in his list of authorities mentioned in the *Mordechai*, where we meet with both Josephs).

As a proof against the identity of these two, we should note the fact that both names appear in one and the same record, and are consequently regarded as designating two different persons. Thus Chiskija b. Manoach, in his *Commentary to the Pentateuch*, written c. 1260, cites both Bechor Schor and Joseph of Orleans.

From the chronological point of view, also, it is difficult to identify Bechor Schor, who was already acquainted with the *Lexicon* of Solomon Ibn Parchon, written in 1161, and certainly flourished as late as the last third of the twelfth century with the Rabbi Gotsce of the Pipe-Rolls of 1131.

Mr. Jacobs will, I think, have to give up the identity in this instance, and to acknowledge that the extracts from Joseph Bechor Schor's *Commentary to the Pentateuch* (pp. 23-25, 259) have no claim to a place in his book.

While R. Joseph, of London, is also styled Rabi (or Rubi) in the Latin records, we find the term *Episcopus*, Bishop, generally applied in these very records to the religious leaders among the English Jews. The episode related on p. 45 shows to what an extent this term was in vogue and recognised. In the Church of St. Paul bishops and abbots were one day seated in council discussing ecclesiastical matters. The assembly was open to all, and several London Jews, among them their bishop, chanced to enter the church. "Welcome, Bishop of the Jews!" one of those present exclaimed. "Receive him among ye, for there is scarcely any of the bishops of England that has not betrayed his lord, the Archbishop of Canterbury, except this one."

The Jewish bishop referred to in this incident, which has to be assigned to the year 1168, is, according to the indisputable assumption of the author, the one named in the Pipe Rolls of 1177-9—Deodatus *Episcopus*; the name Deodatus (just as its French equivalent, Dieudone) occurring in the records generally, being the translation of the Hebrew Elchanan. There exists but one Tosaphist of this name, viz., Elchanan b. Isaac; and as he was the son of the very famous Tosaphist, Isaac b. Samuel, or Isaac the Elder (who was second in importance only to R. Tam his uncle), and lived at the same time as "Deodatus *Episcopus*," the identity is very plausible, and the two names may refer to one and the same person. Mr. Jacobs is, however, unable to supply anything in the way of evidence for this conclusion, although R. Solomon Luria's notice that Elchanan b. Isaac died as a martyr in 1184 is worthy of attention (where he died we are not told; according to Zunz, *Literaturgeschichte der synag. Poesie*, 288, the fact of the martyrdom is itself doubtful), and the point that in the

Latin records after the said year other Episcopi of London Jews are mentioned, but not Elchanan. We can, therefore, in this case not refuse the right of identification; and inasmuch as our author makes use of this right, he gains for his list of learned Rabbis a literary character of activity and versatility, for Elchanan was the author of Tosaphoth which are oft cited, and an interesting example of which is given (p. 269), according to an old Halberstam MS. now at the Ramsgate College Library, and which has reference to England. He was the author of a work on the Calendar (p. 81), and also of religious poems. Mr. Jacobs has included in his work one of the latter in metrical translation, rendered by Mr. I. Zangwill after the manner of Zunz in his German translation (*Syn. Poesie des M.*, p. 249), imitating the Hebrew original in the matter of the acrostic. It is said by Zunz (*loc. cit.*)—without, however, stating their sources—that to this poem (beginning אֵשֶׁת נְעוּרַיִם) Rabbenu Tam added explanations. This could not have been R. Tam of Rameru, but rather his namesake, the martyr of London.

Among the Tosaphists there are two authorities who, in addition to their Hebrew names, bear other names with the distinctive title "Sir" (שִׂיר), namely, R. Jehuda b. Isaac, of Paris, named Sir Leon, and R. Samuel b. Solomon, of Falaise, called Sir Morel. Mr. Jacobs assumes that their title "Sir" points to their residence in England. As regards Sir Leon, Mr. Jacobs devotes to the question, "Was Sir Leon ever in London?" a most interesting excursus (pp. 406-416), and his reasoning is most plausible in which he shows that R. Jehuda, born 1166, who was also called "the Pious," took up his residence in London during the years 1182-1198, a period in which the Jews were banished from Paris and from France in the narrowest sense (*Isle de France*), under King Philip Augustus. He occurs also in the Treasury Rolls by the name of "Leo le Blund," in fact, in the List of London Jews for the year 1186 (p. 88). He undoubtedly received the surname "Blund" on account of the striking colour of his hair, an unusual one among Jews. I consider this instance of identification a most happy one, being confirmed by the fact that "Leo le Blund," which occurs in the said list as the name of one of the most important members of the community, does not appear in the later lists—a circumstance easily explained if we assume that Sir Leon returned to Paris after 1198.

On the other hand, Sir Morel's connection with England rests upon a very weak foundation, in spite of the fact that our author cites some ancient source (p. 53), in which there occurs a person named "R. Morel of England," whom he forthwith identifies with Sir Morel, *i.e.*, R. Samuel of Falaise. The passage occurs in the *Hagahoth*

Maimunioth to Hilch. Ischuth, chap. ix. § 3 (Jacobs omits these particulars), and gives us the same case as is referred to in the *Tosaphoth Kiddushin*, 52a. The *Hagahoth Maimunioth* contain the particulars of the case in a more exact form. We are told that in Troyes it once happened that Isaac the son of R. Hoshaya engaged himself to the daughter of R. Morel of England (ר' מורייל מאינגליטירא), she being a minor. As the name of the daughter to whom he became engaged was not pronounced, and as the father had three daughters who were under age, the case came before R. Jacob Tam for decision as to whether the engagement was valid. The person called "R. Morel of England," was accordingly a contemporary of R. Tam, and in the other quotation (*Tos. Kiddushin*), in which he is not mentioned by name, he is referred to simply as "a rich man" (כת עשיר אחד). The question could, therefore, not have arisen with reference to Sir Morel or R. Samuel b. Salomon of Falaise, who was a respected scholar, and who lived (and this is of vital importance) half a century after the death of R. Tam (1171); he was the teacher of R. Meir of Rothenburg (†1293), and is mentioned in the well-known list of scholars drawn up by Solomon Luria (*Respons*, N. 29), as a contemporary with R. Jechiel of Paris. His teacher, R. Solomon, the Holy, of Dreux, was a pupil of R. Isaac b. Abraham, or R. Isaac the younger, who died at the beginning of the thirteenth century. R. Samuel of Falaise, or Sir Morel, thus belongs to the thirteenth century (Zunz, *Zur Geschichte und Lit.*, 1245), and the Morel of Norwich mentioned in the Pipe Rolls of 1192 as having died in the reign of Richard I., and leaving a collection of books and two daughters (p. 145), can naturally not be identified—as Jacobs has attempted—with the Tosaphist, Sir Morel. It would be more reasonable to assume that the rich "R. Morel, of England," the contemporary of R. Tam, is the same as the Morel mentioned in the Pipe Rolls of 1192. This statement of ours does naturally not affect the assumption that R. Samuel b. Salomon, made some stay in England, and that he brought the name of Sir Morel from that country, but the attempt to identify him with his namesake must give way, since he belongs, not to the twelfth, but to the thirteenth century. Further, there is no ground for identifying Samuel b. Salomon, whose sister married R. Elchanan (p. 412, according to Zunz, *Literaturgesch.*, 253), with R. Samuel of Falaise. If Rabbi Elias, "the Holy," of York, was really, as Jacobs, following Zunz (*Zur Geschichte*, p. 49), assumes, a disciple of R. Samuel b. Salomon, i.e., of Sir Morel, he could not have been one of the victims of the great York tragedy (1190). To put the matter more clearly, ר' שמואל, to whom, according to *Tosaphoth Joma* 27^a (beginning with the word הוֹלֵכֶת), R. Elias addresses the question, was not R. Samuel b.

Salomon of Falaise, but an older R. Samuel, probably R. Samuel b. Meir. In the other passage quoted by Zunz (*Tos. Zebachim*, 14^b, והרי) the questioner alone is mentioned, viz., R. Elias of York, and not the person to whom the question is addressed.

In the account given by William of Newbury of the catastrophe at York (1190) mention is made of a Doctor of the Law hailing from beyond the sea, *i.e.*, from France, who in a remarkable speech exhorts his coreligionists to prefer death at their own hands to apostasy from their faith.

Grätz (*History of the Jews*, VI. 456) has already derived from the martyrologium of R. Ephraim of Bonn that the Doctor of the Law mentioned by the English chronicler was R. Yomtob of Joigny, who often occurs in the Tosaphoth, and is named הקדוש the martyr. Naturally, Mr. Jacobs accepts this identification, and he ascribes to this same R. Yomtob the beautiful hymn אָמֵנָם כֵּן, which belongs to the Ritual for the Eve of the Day of Atonement. As regards the identification itself, to which Mr. Jacobs lays claim (p. 109 : "I believe I may claim the credit of having identified the author with the Yomtob of Joigny who led the Jews at York"), Zunz is in reality the author (*Literatur Gesch. d. S.P.*, p. 286), with this difference, that Zunz places the martyrdom of R. Yomtob not in York, but in Bray in France (1191), as according to Ephraim of Bonn, a R. Yomtob plays the same rôle both in York and in Bray. This repetition is no doubt an error. The said hymn has been well translated into English (109-111) by Mr. Zangwill, who has preserved the rhyme-system and the alphabetical acrostic of the original. A son of the martyr R. Yomtob, namely R. Isaac, to whom R. Simson of Sens (beginning of thirteenth century) addressed a question (p. 241), is ingeniously traced by our author in the List of London Jews (c. 1186) to which reference has already been made, in which he occurs as Isaac of Jueigny.

The following are some of the other Tosaphists transplanted by Mr. Jacobs to English soil. Abraham b. Jehuda is supposed to be identical with Abraham fil Jude de Parisii in the Fine and Oblate Rolls of 1204-1206 ; in fact a son of Jehuda the Pious, or Sir Leon. The probability is that a Tosaphist named Abraham b. Jehuda never existed. The only passage adduced by Zunz (*Z.G. u. Lit.*, p. 48) is that of *Baba Kamna* 87^b (*s.v.* דַּכְתִּיב), in which occur the words הַר"י אַבְרָהָם בֶּן, supposed to be an abbreviation for הַר"י אַבְרָהָם בֶּן הַר"י יְהוּדָה. In the parallel passage, however, which is to be found in the *Tosaphoth Kiddushin* 15^a (*s.v.* כִּי טוֹב), אַבְרָהָם alone occurs, by which, as Zunz himself points out on the previous page, Abraham b. Joseph of Orleans, the father-in-law of Sir Leon, is

understood. Zunz also cites the passage in *Kiddushin* 15a, but overlooks the point that its contents are identical with the passage in *Baba Kamma* 87b; and that both passages must refer to one and the same Abraham. In connection with Abraham b. Jehuda, Mr. Jacobs adduces on p. 417 two further passages:—*Bathra* 43a, where I have been unable to trace any reference, and *Kiddushin* 15a—just the passage parallel with that of *Kamma* 87b. A few lines further on, Jacobs unsuspectingly quotes the same passage, *Kiddushin* 15a, on behalf of Abraham b. Joseph. Chajim of Paris (*vide* Mordechai, *B. Kamma*, viii. 87) is to be identical with Vives de Paris, who is mentioned in a Latin record (1204-1206) as having lived in London. Owing to the repeated recurrence of the name Vives (= ויב) — Mr. Jacobs' list on p. 363 containing eighteen of that name—the similarity of name can supply no proof for the identity. The same argument holds with regards to the identification of Mosse de Paris, occurring in a Latin record of 1202-1206, with R. Moses of Paris, in whose name a remark on exegesis is quoted.

R. Joseph ben Isaac, whom Mr. Jacobs names without further comment, is none other than R. Joseph of Orleans, of whom we have already spoken. R. Samuel b. Elchanan, a son of the Elchanan to whom reference has already been made (*Tos. Eruchin*, 18b), is supposed to occur in the Latin records under the name of Samuel fil Dieudonne. That one of the most celebrated Tosaphists, R. Jacob Tam of Orleans, lived in London, and was killed there in 1189, is generally known. But less is known concerning R. Menachem, or R. Elias Menachem, of London, some extracts of whose Decisions on Halacha translated from a Halberstam MS. appear on p. 288, and who seems to have also devoted himself to the study of grammar (*v.* p. 287). He lived probably towards the end of the twelfth century.

Two persons are styled "Punctuators" in the Latin records:— "Samuel le Pointur," who lived in Bristol in 1194, and contributed to the gift which the English Jews presented to Richard I. on his return from captivity; and "Benedict le Puncteur" of Oxford, who is mentioned on the same occasion. Mr. Jacobs assumes that Pointur and Puncteur is the same as Nakdan (נקדן), the well-known expression by which the Punctuators of Bible MSS. are styled, who, in consequence of their vocation, were often at the same time grammarians, and many of whom added largely to the literature on grammatical subjects. Once acknowledge this signification of "Pointur," "Puncteur," and there is no difficulty in following the further conjecture of our author. Samuel of Bristol would then be identical with Samuel Nakdan, quoted by Moses the Nakdan, also an Englishman, and of whom we shall have something more to say; and Bene-

dict of Oxford would be no less a personage than Berechya the Nakdan, an author of the highest significance and versatility.

A grammatical massorite work by Samuel the Nakdan has in all probability been preserved (Mr. Jacobs regards it as certain); it exists in MS. (Qu. 647) in the Royal Library of Berlin, bearing the title רייקות מרבנו שמואל. It would supply a further proof of the remarkable activity of English Jews in the twelfth century in this field of literature. Our author would recognise a reference to Samuel Nakdan in the glosses of Benjamin (of Canterbury) attached to the *Sepher Hagaluy* of Joseph Kimchi (pp. 281, 404). The רבנו שמואל, however, often quoted by Benjamin, the author of these glosses, is naturally R. Samuel b. Meir, the great Bible commentator, the brother of R. Tam (*vide* Matthew's Introduction to *S. Hagaluy*, p. xi.).

The identification of the Punctuator Benedict, of Oxford, with Berechya Ha-Nakdan—a subject to which Mr. Jacobs has devoted his investigations on former occasions (JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, April and July, 1890), has been brought to a high degree of probability. The chronological difficulties, which stood in the way of placing Berechya in the twelfth century, were successfully overcome in the discussions referred to above; and, further, the relation in which this remarkable writer stood to England were more clearly brought out from the internal evidence of his works.

I need not dwell at greater length upon this point, but simply assert that Mr. Jacobs has had the good fortune to render his theory with regard to the date and the English citizenship of Berechya a very acceptable one. If he really be the same person as Benedict of Oxford, this ancient seat of learning would in that case have the honour of having sheltered already in the twelfth century one of the most interesting representatives of Jewish literature.

Besides the Punctuators Samuel and Berechya, whose claim to English citizenship has, for the first time, been taken up by Mr. Jacobs, there is another Punctuator—one, indeed, who may be regarded as the most celebrated of the whole group, R. Moses, the Nakdan, whose existence affords the clearest evidence that the keenest interest was manifested in England in the domain of the Massorah and in grammatical studies connected therewith, and that literary works sprung up on English soil; for Moses the Nakdan is also called Moses of London (רבנו משה מלונדרש, El. Levita on Art. כחש of Kimchi's Lexicon).

Since the time of Geiger (*Wiss. Zeitschrift*, v. 419), one is accustomed to identify this Moses with another Moses, viz., the author of the *השם* 'D, who has the more definite designation "Moses b. Isaac

הנשיאה of England.” In this expression הנשיאה is the translation of the female name Comitissa, a name which occurs in the Latin records (vid. *Rabbins Français*, 1877, p. 739) ; and in the Pipe-Rolls of 1177-9 there occurs even the name of one Isaac fil Comitisse, whom Mr. Jacobs regards as the father of the author of the *Onyx Book*.¹ I myself have by additional arguments maintained in the Introduction to my edition of Joseph Kimchi's Grammar (ספר זכרון, Berlin, 1888, p. ix.) that Moses the Nakdan was identical with Moses b. Isaac, inasmuch as I showed that, in the glosses to the said grammar proceeding from the pen of Moses the Nakdan, there are certain peculiarities which are also apparent in the *Onyx Book*. Mr. Jacobs has now weakened this idea as to the identity of the two persons named Moses, which at one time had almost become an axiom, since he proves, upon the strength of the concluding words of the Berlin Codex of the *Nikkud-Book* (Or Oct. 243) by Moses the Nakdan, that the full name of the latter was Moses b. Yomtob. The concluding words referred to are :—סליק יסוד הר"ם :—בה"ר יום טוב מלוניטריש.

Zunz gives one “Yomtob in London,” without however stating his source, for the year 1175 (*Zur G. und L.*, p. 193) : according to Mr. Jacobs, he would be the father of the Nakdan Moses, while his son “Magister Elias fil Magistri Moysis, Pontifex Judaeorum” was the highest authority among the English Jews of the thirteenth century. Now, as there occurs in Moses b. Isaac's *Onyx Book* a reference to Moses ben Yomtob as the teacher of the author, one cannot help regarding as authentic the concluding words of the Berlin Codex of the הנקוד, ס' though they are not to be found in any other MS. ; and agreeing with Mr. Jacobs' theory that the full name of Moses of London, Ha-Nakdan, author of the *Sepher Hannikud* (or ררבי הנקוד) and of glosses on the grammar of Joseph Kimchi, was Moses b. Yomtob, and that he was the teacher of Moses b. Isaac, author of the ס' השהם. Consequently, the fact of the coincidence between the glosses on the זכרון ס' and the השהם ס' dare not be employed as an argument in favour of the identity of the authors of these works, but in explaining that the influence exerted by one upon the other was that of teacher upon disciple. In like manner we have to regard the relation between the concluding chapter of the *Onyx Book* and the *Nikkud Book* of Moses Ha-Nakdan— not that the former was an abridged form of the rules concerning vowels and accents

¹ Mr. Jacobs also regards his son Moses as identical with Mosse de Cantebregia (Cambridge), who according to the Latin documents was settled in London in the years 1189, 1194, 1198.

laid down by the same author and collected in a separate treatise, but we must assume that the author of the *Onyx Book* adopted in the last chapters of his work the rules of his teacher in an abridged form. An exact comparison between the two works, including all matters of detail, would be a most desirable subject for investigation. Mr. Jacobs has, at all events, the merit of having contributed, by means of his having distinguished between the two personages named Moses, to the elucidation of a problem connected with the history of literature, thereby enriching the gallery of celebrities who flourished in early English Jewry. If England was really the native land of Samuel the Nakdan, author of the MS. preserved at Berlin, then indeed the history of Hebrew grammar may be said to record this interesting fact, that, in the second half of the twelfth century, England played, to a certain extent, the leading part in that field of literary activity which lies between Grammar and Massorah. This fact is connected with the twofold influence, which, on the one hand R. Tam, on the other hand the short yet stimulating sojourn of Ibn Ezra in England, exerted upon the direction of the studies pursued by the Jews of this country. The teacher of Rameru, who was also the author of a didactic poem on accents, inclined students to the work of the Massorah. Abraham Ibn Ezra pointed out the necessity for attention to grammar. External causes must have contributed to the fact that Joseph Kimchi appears as the leading grammatical authority in England.

Just as his *Sepher Sikkaron* was furnished by Moses of London with supplementary comments, his *Sepher Hagaluy* received at the hands of another Englishman, Benjamin of Canterbury,¹ a critical commentary, in which he defends the views of R. Tam, his teacher, against Kimchi.

It is strange that there should be associated with the men who at that time actively cultivated on English soil the study of Hebrew philology, a Russian, the first Russian Jew, forsooth, mentioned in the History of Jewish Literature. His name is Isaac of Tschernigow, and it is in his name that Moses b. Isaac communicates in the *Onyx Book*, a comparison between the Hebrew word צב and a Russian word having a similar sound. As a matter of fact the Pipe-Rolls of Henry II. (1180-2) mention one Ysaac de Russie, and Mr. Jacobs has a perfect right to identify him as the Isaac of Tschernigow, who

¹According to Jacobs' theory (p. 282) Canterbury is an error for Cambridge, and the commentator, Benjamin, a disciple of R. Tam, would thus be the same as the Magister Benjamin of Cambridge mentioned in the Latin records of 1194.

undoubtedly lived in England about the same time. Mr. Jacobs might also have referred to ר' יצחק מרוסיני, who is named in an anonymous commentary to the Pentateuch, dating from the first third of the thirteenth century (vide *Keren Chemed*, vii. 69; Zunz, *Zur G. u. Lit.*, p. 80), and who may perhaps be identical with our Ysaac de Russie. In that case we should have to assume that he quitted England for Germany or Bohemia, for it was here, according to Zunz, that the author of the said commentary lived, with whom and with whose father Isaac of Russia mentioned by him came in personal contact.

Our author has, with delicate sense and remarkable skill, made use of a highly interesting monument of mediæval literature in favour of England, and made it possible to obtain an insight into the system of education and the organisation of schools among English Jews during the period of which his book treats. The literary work referred to is the חקי התורה, a MS. of which exists in Oxford, dating at the latest from the thirteenth century, and which Gûdemann in his history of the Culture and Education among the Jews of France and Germany (Vienna, 1880), published in the Hebrew original and translated into German. The MS. contains some very remarkable statutes for governing the system of education in the lower and higher schools, and the impression is gained from their perusal that the system laid down was not merely a theoretical one, but perfectly workable and actually carried into practice. The grounds upon which Mr. Jacobs would make England the home of these statutes, though not quite convincing, are yet very clear. As far as I am concerned, the following circumstance is of importance: namely, that the statutes presuppose a capital of the realm having a central influence upon the other communities of the country; that is, a Jewry with a certain uniform organisation, as it existed in England about the time of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Add to this, that the statutes have reference to a country speaking the French Romanese tongue, within the reach of German and Northern-French schools, which regarded Bible and Talmud as the exclusive subject of study, and that in spite of this, there is the reference to מנהג צרפתים. At that time the Jews of England spoke French, just as the ruling classes of the country. This is evident from the numerous French names which they bore in addition to their Hebrew names. Even Moses b. Isaac employs in his *Sepher Hashoham* French expressions for translation and explanation.

The direction contained in the statutes, that the teachers shall in the course of their instruction translate the Bible text into the

vernacular, as also the Targum, is very significant. As stated, the latter was a provision tending to introduce students to the language of the Talmud and to render the study of the Halacha somewhat easier.

It is but natural that Mr. Jacobs should adduce extracts out of the work which Abraham Ibn Ezra composed in England, in order to illustrate the intellectual activity and religious views of the Jews of England, about the middle of the twelfth century. The accident is rather pleasant, that the English friend of Ibn Ezra, to whom he dedicated the work composed by him in London in 1158 upon the principles of the Jewish religion—the Book *Jesod Mōra*¹ (יסוד מורה)—should be a namesake of the author of the work we are reviewing: and we do not begrudge him the innocent satisfaction of rendering the name יוסף בן יעקב which occurs in the introductory verses to the *Jesod Mōra* by “Joseph Jacobs.” Besides, Joseph b. Jacob did not write—as is stated on p. 30—a supercommentary on Ibn Ezra’s commentary to Genesis, but he wrote down Ibn Ezra’s commentary to the portion ויחי (Genesis xlvii. 28) just as he had heard it in London from his own mouth. The following is the statement occurring at the beginning of the said portion in Friedländer’s edition of the commentary on Genesis:—אני יוסף בר’ יעקב ממורייל שמעתי מפי:—² *זֶה הַחֵכֶם פִּירוּשׁ זֶה הַפֶּרֶשָׁה בְּלוֹנְדֵרֶשׁ וְכַתְּבִתִּיהָ בְּלִשׁוֹנִי*. From these words we may infer, as we might easily have imagined, that Ibn Ezra while in London held discourses on the exegesis of the weekly portions. He explained the portion ויחי in the same month in which he composed his Sabbath Epistle, Tebeth 4919=December, 1158.

Mr. Jacobs has not omitted the awful story regarding Ibn Ezra’s stay in England, related by the well-known enemy of philosophy, R. Moses b. Chisdai of Tachau, who lived a century after the death of the former (p. 262, according to כתב המים in Ozar Nechmad, III. 97). But Mr. Jacobs has translated the passage in question not quite correctly. I shall, therefore, now give an exact rendering of it. Moses of Tachau is defending the belief in the existence of demons, and adduces, in proof of his contention, the following:—“Even Ibn Ezra went wrong in respect of demons,³ which ever accompanied him,

¹ Jacobs writes “Jesod Moreh as if it were יסוד מורה.”

² Cf. Grätz, *G. D. Juden* VI. 447, in which he cites the following colophon to his commentary on the twelve minor prophets:—אני יוסף ממדוייל תלמידו כתבתיהו והוספתי בו פירושים על דבריו כמו ששמעתי מפיו.

³ Since he denied their existence, as was shown in the preceding passage, by means of a quotation.

and he denied their existence. He could, of course, without much ceremony, attain the knowledge of such exalted and great things, concerning which not even the angels have any knowledge.² And yet (although he denied the existence of evil spirits), the demons showed him that they did exist in the world (instead of שישנו read שישנם). I heard from Englishmen, among whom he died, that he once rode in a forest, and came among a pack of dogs, who stood gazing at him: they were all black. Surely these were demons. When he got out from among them he was taken dangerously ill, and it was of this illness that he died." If we wish to explain this story in a rational manner, we might say that it really once happened to Ibn Ezra, when in England, that he was confronted by a pack of black dogs, possibly hounds for hunting, in one of those forests with which England at the time abounded, and that he gave a poetic colouring to the incident, which made him somewhat nervous, by comparing the hounds with demons. Thereupon malice went to work, and converted the incident into a meeting with real evil spirits. Whatever the case may be, the story which Moses of Tachau heard from the mouths of English Jews is an evidence for the statement that the memory of Ibn Ezra in England did not escape the accusation of heresy; and that, prompted perhaps by the influence of Christian imagination, he was represented, as a punishment for his free-thinking views, which did not even stop short at denying the existence of demons, as being terrified and chastised by these very demons.

The story itself is a remarkable specimen of Jewish folklore among the Jews of England in the thirteenth century. I must leave it to experts in this department of science to follow up the connection between the particular points which come out in the story and the

¹ ובפר כהן instead of וכפר בהן ("from the ox of the priest)," which, of course, is meaningless. This obvious emendation is already given by Steinschneider, in his treatise on Ibn Ezra, p. 81.

² Said in irony. The Hebrew original is thus:— מיד היה יכול להגיע:— מחקורי גבורות וגדולות שגם המלאכים לא היו יודעים. The irony is contained in the word מיד, which I have rendered, "of course, without much ceremony." It seems to be a Germanism. Even now, the word "gleich" (in the sense of immediately=Hebr. מיד), has in colloquial German an ironical meaning. Moses of Tachau wishes to say—Ibn Ezra, who did not acknowledge the existence of demons, though he was sensibly affected by them, assumes the knowledge of the deeper and more exalted matters connected with metaphysics, with the existence and working of God and his relation to the universe, of which not even the higher intelligences, viz., the angels, have no knowledge.

general representations of demonology. I would, however, just refer to the "black poodle," in Goethe's *Faust*, the "pith" of which is the Devil. "He lies quite still and grins at me," says Faust (Part I. l. 940), just, as in the story before us, do the hounds—which are really demons—stand still and gaze at Ibn Ezra (כלבים שהיו עומדים ומעיינים עליו וכלם מרחורים). We might also call to mind the old French romance of *Baldwin, Count of Flanders*, in which, as a punishment for his arrogance, he is confronted with the Devil while hunting in the forest, not, however, in the form of a hound, but in the form of a beautiful dame, whom he thereupon marries.¹

In the story as related by Moses of Tachau, the point which claims special attention is the statement made by the narrator himself, without any hesitation whatsoever, that Ibn Ezra died in England. Mr. Jacobs seizes the opportunity briefly to refer to the difficult question concerning the place where Ibn Ezra ended his life. This is not the occasion, and it would indeed carry us too far, to discuss the point at length; but we should mention that Mr. Jacobs is inclined to the opinion that, if Ibn Ezra did not die in England, he died somewhere near England, viz., in Rouen, which at the time belonged to England. He assumes that the place דרום, which was formerly read רודום and taken to mean Rodez, in Southern France, and in which Ibn Ezra finished a series of exegetical works between 1155 and 1157, is not Dreux, as I suggested (*Revue des Etudes Juives*, XVII. 300; Jacobs names Dr. Neubauer as author of this opinion), but that we have to read רודום, Rodom, which is but an abbreviated form of Rodomagus, i.e., Rouen. Steinschneider already considers רודום, further defined by Eleazar b. Mattatias as לאנגליטירא, to be Rouen; and Dr. Simonsen of Copenhagen told me personally, after the appearance of my article referred to above in the *Revue des Etudes Juives*, that he was convinced that Ibn Ezra's place of abode in North France was not Dreux, but Rouen. I have but mentioned briefly this opinion here—which, if it receives full confirmation, will have tended to clear up an important particular in the biography of Ibn Ezra in a manner differing from the view held hitherto.

I must now conclude my observations with reference to Mr. Jacobs' comprehensive and stimulative volume. Some other hand will probably be commissioned to undertake for this Review an estimate of the significance of this interesting work as bearing upon the external history of the English Jews of the twelfth century, the knowledge of their culture, their internal relations, their connection with the State

¹ Vide John Dunlop's work, translated into German by F. Liebrecht, *Geschichte der Prosadichtungen*. (Berlin, 1851), p. 479.

and Christian society. The material contained in the book itself will form a solid basis for the further investigation and elaboration of the history of the Jews in England before their expulsion in the year 1290. Out of this material may be developed a clear picture of the conditions and social status of the English Jews of the twelfth century. I must deny it to myself to touch upon some few lines in this picture as they appear in Mr. Jacobs' volume, though having a peculiar charm and remarkable interest for me. I would rather do my duty in another respect, and point out some small errors or slips occurring in the book, and which might easily be removed in the second edition, the appearance of which, we trust, may soon become a necessity.¹

Page 1, line 3, "Theodosius," read Theodorus.

P. 11, l. 5, "Ps. xcvi. 5," read Ps. xcvii. 7. (In the source whence the passage is translated, the 97th Psalm is, according to the Vulgate, numbered 96).

Ib. The reference, viz., lxix. 29, is missing at the end of the second quotation from Psalms.

P. 30, l. 8, "486," read 436.

Ib., l. 20, "like a camel clothed in silk." This is to be the translation of גמל נושא משי; it ought to be, a camel laden with silk, a camel carrying a load of silk and yet remaining but a camel. Cf. חמור נושא ספרים, an ass loaded with books.

P. 31, l. 5, "the source of all life" (Heb. מקור חיים). More correctly : a source of life. Cf. Prov. x. 11.

P. 32, l. 17, "and Rabbis of the Talmud" belongs to the following sentence. In the original the words are:—ומדברי חכמי התלמוד ויחכם ויבין סודות עמוקים. "From the sayings of the Rabbis of the Talmud he shall," etc.

P. 33, l. 11 from below, "xix. 11," read xvi. 29.

P. 37, l. 13 from below, "and warmed the fire in me." This is the translation of והמתתי בערה בי. To be corrected according to the concluding words of Esther i. 12 ("his anger burned in him").

P. 38, l. 4, expunge "with fire."

P. 52, l. 17, "R. Jehuda says in the name of R. Eleazar." The original is: אמר רב יהודה אמר רב ואיתימא ר' אלעזר. *i.e.*, R. Jehuda said in the name of Rab, or, according to another tradition, R. Eleazar said it (as his own opinion).

P. 53, l. 5, "52b," read 52a.

P. 73, l. 14 from below, "a brother-in-law." To be corrected according to JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II. 324.

¹ I have already in the foregoing remarks pointed out some of these.

P. 77, l. 16, from below, "4983," read 4943.

P. 99, l. 16, "1182," ,, 1189.

P. 109, l. 8, "Paitamni," read Paitanim.

P. 111, l. 9, the passage from the *Mordechai* is wrongly quoted. It should be *Mordechai Sabbath*, 250, *Hagak. Mord.*, 452.

Ib., l. 15, "Menachem," read Meschullam.

P. 131, l. 2, "and they destroyed the House of Prayer and Rabbi Yomtob also, and slew about 60 souls." The original is as follows:—
 "ויברחו אל בית התפלה ויעמוד הר"י י"ט וישחט כס' נפשות
 to the House of Prayer. Thereupon R. Yomtob rose and slew about 60 souls."

Ib., l. 7, "going and returning," משהתענג ומרוך, *i.e.*, according to Deut. xxviii. 56: "from delicateness and tenderness."

Ib., l. 8, "slew themselves," wrong translation for נשרפו, "were burned." So in following line, "of those slain by others or by themselves," wrong translation of והשרופים וההרוגים.

Ib., l. 10. "their holy bodies," belongs to the previous sentence, מן הגופים קדושים ונשים ונשים, meaning "the holy bodies of men and women."

Ib., "burned," read destroyed (הרסו).

Ib., l. 11, "they despised," wrong rendering of ויבוזו (and spoiled), as if it said ויִזְנוּ.

Ib., l. 12, "and they rejoiced in the money and the multitude of pure gold which were not equalled for beauty." This is the translation of נחמדים מזהב ומפז רב אשר אין כערבם בנוי ויופי. The words have reference to the stolen books, the value of which is extolled in the language of Psalm xix. 11. There the following words occur in the Hebrew:— והביאום לקולוניא ולשאר מקומות ומכרום ליהודים. *i.e.*, They brought the books which had been robbed to Cologne, and sold them to the Jews.

In accordance with the original, the lines 14-17, roughly rendered, have to be corrected.

Ib., l. 16, "these cities," כמה עיירות, means "many cities."

Ib., l. 18, "twenty-two men," read about 20 men (כב' איש to be corrected into ככ' איש). Cf. Wiener, *Emek Habacha*, p. 36, last lines.

P. 172, l. 3, "Zur Geschichte," read Zur Geschichte, p. 144.

P. 178, l. 17, "25b," read 45b.

Ib., l. 20, "certain benedictions"; only the benedictions at grace after meals are implied, ברכת המזון.

Ib., l. 8 from below, "R. Abraham," read R. Abraham of Orleans.

P. 199, l. 8, "Susskind of Wurzburg who was a rather distinguished Jewish minne-singer." The Jewish minne-singer was Süsskind of

Trimberg. Jacobs refers for this identity to Grätz's *History* (VI. 277), but Grätz rejects, for obvious reasons, the identity of the two.

P. 243, l. 5 from below, "two Peshitim," read twelve Peshitim (י"ב פשיטים).

Ib., l. 13, "preachers," wrong translation of חזנים.

P. 251, l. 8, "Perush," read Parush (פְּרוֹשׁ, singular of פְּרוּשִׁים).

P. 262, l. 11, Ibn Ezra's comment on Deut. xxxii. 17, as related by R. Moses of Tachau, is not rendered correctly. The original is as follows:—הדערה (read שיסורו ושיסורו הטעם שישורו ושיסורו) ומה שכתוב יזכהו לשרים הטעם שישורו ושיסורו, ממנו כמו עצבים שמעצבים אותו שרים in the passage of Deuteronomy, because they turn¹ the understanding from him (viz., God); they are also called עֲצָבִים, because they vex or offend² God. Jacob's rendering, l. 11-15, has to be corrected accordingly.

Ib., l. 20, "reckoned and wrote." The original is חושבים ומונים, i.e., "consider and appoint."

P. 263, l. 9 from below, "heard him comment on Exodus." It was not Exodus but the twelve minor Prophets which Joseph b. Jacob heard Ibn Ezra comment upon.

P. 265, l. 9, "all the congregations in France and all the inhabitants of the Isles." In the original (Hebrew Appendix to Wiener's *Emek Habacha*, page 9) it reads: כל קהלות צרפת ואי הים ורינום; the singular אי הים is even more applicable to England than the plural.

P. 279, l. 1, "I consider myself," אהשב, in the original, to be read אֶחְשַׁב, passive "I am considered."

Ib., l. 6. In the original thus, המתגלגל באי הים אלה המית ואלה הים, meaning, The wheel of fortune turned to the Isle of the Sea and killed the one, and kept alive the others. Jacobs' translation is inaccurate.

P. 280, l. 5, "the mind of the childless one is disturbed." This is the translation of עדת שכל שכולה (vide JEWISH QUARTERLY REVIEW, II, 522), beyond doubt incorrect. שכל has to be read שְׁכָל, and the expression would be rendered "the congregation of intelligence" (i.e., the intelligent) is sorrowful." In the following phrase, ועטר, בון ומשפחה שעלה, has doubtless to be read ועטרה instead of ועטר, meaning "contempt and a low generation surround them."

The second verse is as follows:—ואזן רב עשיריה ערילה לכל שואל

¹ שְׂרִים means, according to Ibn Ezra, "the devastators, destroyers of reason," as he expresses it *in loco*, מישור הדעת.

² Cf. יעציבוהו, Psalm lxxviii. 40.

³ Cf. חקי התורה אנשי שכל הראשונים in the superscription to the referred to above (Güdemann, p. 267).

⁴ So we have to read for the two readings עשירים and עשירה.

ולנותן מהולה, *i.e.*, "the ear of most of their rich men is uncircumcised (deaf) for every one who asks, but circumcised for him who gives." Jacobs has misunderstood the words וְלִנְתָן מְהוּלָה and rendered them by "and the giver of mercy," which makes no sense.

Ib., l. 11, "falsehood," wrong translation of נבלה, *vide* Isaiah ix. 16.

Ib., l. 14, "a piece of dry and mouldy bread." The original is פת הרבה ועמלה, an expression made up of פת הרבה (Prov. xvii.1), and the Talmudic expression פת עמילה (*Pesachim*, 37a). Berachayah, perhaps, does not take עמילה in the Talmudic sense but in another sense, meaning "toilsome," thus "dry bread earned by toil." At all events, "mouldy" cannot be justified.

Ib., l. 24, "which is only printed in the *editio princeps*." The Berlin edition of the משלי שועלים of 1756, has also the introduction.

P. 299, l. 3, "Fieldberg," read Friedeberg.

P. 303, l. 19, "Placitorium," read Placitorum.

P. 342, l. 12 from below, "143," read 243.

P. 359. In the list of names Sir Morel, Morel of England is missing (pp. 53, 145, 146, 408); I also miss the name of Samuel b. Salomon of Falaise.

Ib., in number 449 read 189a instead of 190a.

P. 397, l. 3, "Solomon," read Samuel.

P. 398, l. 14 from below, Joseph Kimchi flourished not at the end, but about the middle of the twelfth century.

Ib., l. 13 from below, the *Sepher Galuy* is no "grammar," but a polemical work of grammatical, lexicographical and exegetical contents, directed against R. Tam and Menachem b. Saruk.

P. 418, l. 7 from below. The passage "Z. G., 52 till § 475," must be expunged. By some error it has slipped in from p. 419, l. 10 from below.

P. 419, l. 6-8. The remark "Add. Z. G. 26, 51.....566," resting on the Register of Names in Zunz's *Zur Geschichte und Literatur* must be expunged, since the passages in question are not referred by Zunz to Jehuda the Pious, of Paris, *i.e.*, Sir Leon, but to the other Jehuda the Pious, Jehuda b. Samuel, of Worms.

P. 421, l. 15, before "Pesach." add Tosaphoth.

The corrections, stated above, may serve to prove to the author, that I have read his work with that attention and interest which it merits in the highest degree.